DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 900 SO 014 471

AUTHOR Behn, William; And Others
TITLE The Transformation of Adulthood: Its Implications for Youth. Discussion Paper 74-3.
INSTITUTION Portola Inst., Inc., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 74
GRANT NE-G-00-3-0205
NOTE 41p.; For related documents, see SO 014 468-473. A report of the Project on Educational Requirements for Industrial Democracy.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alienation; Bureaucracy; *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Educational Needs; *Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; Industry; Secondary Education; *Socialization; *Work Environment; *Youth

ABSTRACT

Because schools serve society by reproducing the dominant social, economic, and political values reflected by the prevailing institutions and ideologies, educational reform is only possible when it does not conflict with the structure of society. Thus when adult work roles are transformed, the socialization of youth will follow closely. A review of research indicates that not only do schools produce cognitive skills, they also develop those character traits which all workers need: proper level of subordination, discipline, supremacy of cognitive over affective modes of response, and motivation according to external reward structures. Schools differentially socialize children into the attitudes and behaviors appropriate to the position they are expected to fill in the hierarchy. The alienation that youth feel toward school, then, has its roots in the demands of work organizations with their focus on wage contracts and pyramidal hierarchies rather than on human relationships. Alienation from both product and process of work is mirrored in the alienation from the schooling process. Thus, the nature of work must be changed to be more democratic, participative, cooperative, and interdependent. Youth will not be socialized to be creative, participative, and cooperative until the social relations of adults are characterized by these traits. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225900

THE TRANSFORMATION OF ADULTHOOD: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR YOUTH

by

William Behn, Martin Carnoy, Michael Carter
Joyce Crain, and Henry Levin

Discussion Paper 74-3
April, 1974

Project: Educational Requirements for Industrial Democracy

Portola Institute
540 Santa Cruz Avenue
Menlo Park, California 94025

SP 014 471

This paper was prepared for a special issue of the School Review (November 1974) devoted to a review of Youth: Transition to Adulthood. The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

FOREWORD

One of the important functions of schools is the preparation of the young for the world of work. Research on the nature of educational organizations and the production of educational services has stressed the correspondence between the activities and outputs of the schools with the requirements of work organizations. In recent years worker dissatisfaction has been rising, and it appears that there has been an associated increase in employee disruption of production. Some business firms have responded to these problems by attempting to reorganize work to increase the participation of workers in decisionmaking and to change the nature of jobs. This movement towards greater "industrial democracy" is gaining momentum both in the United States and in Europe, and as a result it appears to be generating a new set of requirements for worker characteristics.

The purpose of the project on Educational Requirements for Industrial Democracy is to examine the correspondence between socialization to occupational roles generally--via education, in particular--and the organization and content of work. An understanding of this correspondence is then applied to the study of changes in the nature of work in order to predict new demands that will be placed on the education system and other institutions of socialization. The analysis of possible responses of educational institutions to such demands will inform debate on educational reforms at both the curricular and institutional level.

The project research involves parallel examination of schools and firms in order to ascertain the correspondence between the formation and utilization of workers' traits in the context of traditional modes of work organization and under the various approaches to industrial democracy. This research will include the study of the supply of worker traits, socialization to occupational roles, educational production relations in the U.S. schools, the operation of U.S. labor markets and the demand for educational characteristics, and the relationship between worker characteristics, job characteristics and worker productivity.

A taxonomy of educational reforms and a taxonomy of the dimensions of work reform will be developed to provide an analytic framework for

describing important distinctions between reforms of education and work respectively. Commonly proposed reforms, and reforms with which there is some practical experience will be described with the aid of these taxonomies.

A survey will be conducted of selected firms in the U.S. and abroad that have experimented with different forms of work reorganization constituting varying degrees of industrial democracy. Similarly, a survey is planned of selected schools that are experimenting with corresponding types of school reorganization and educational reforms. Special attention will be given to the relevance of the most prominent types of educational reform for changing the educational characteristics of workers in order to meet the new work requirements.

The discussion paper presented here is part of a series of papers reporting on-going research. The final project report will represent a comprehensive document that outlines the probable extent and impact of work reorganization on schools and the educational system.

PREFACE

In early 1974 the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee issued its report, Youth: Transition to Adulthood. The Committee was chaired by James S. Coleman, and it was composed of social scientists, biologists, and educational professionals. According to the Committee, the aim of the Report was: "...to stimulate the search for institutional inventions which will ensure that youth acquires the capabilities for fulfilling the demands and opportunities they will confront as adults, and thereby gain the self-esteem and self-fulfillment all persons need." (p.7) The Report addresses itself to a particular perception of the problem and its solutions.

In order to produce a discussion of the Report, the School Review invited a number of analyses for its November 1974 edition. The following essay represents a response to that request. The authors have been engaged in a study of "The Educational Requirements for Industrial Democracy" which was funded by the National Institute of Education and is being carried out under the auspices of the Portola Institute. We have used the substance of the project as a focus for analyzing the Report, and we hope that the sharp contrast between our views and those of the authors of the Report will serve as a useful framework for discussing and implementing ways to improve the status of both adults and youth.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD ii

PREFACE iv

Section

I. INTRODUCTION 1
Assumptions About School and Work 4

II. SOCIALIZATION FOR WORK ROLES 8
Social Class Differentiation for Work Roles 14

III. REAPPRAISING WHAT IS WRONG 21

IV. WHAT IS TO BE DONE? 28

BIBLIOGRAPHY 33

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the underlying tenets of American culture has been an enormous faith in the efficacy of its schools to create and sustain the "good society". Schools have been expected to provide universal attainment of literacy, an effectively functioning democracy, equalization of opportunity, and rapid economic growth. And, if some schooling has been considered to be desirable, more schooling has been considered to be even better.

But, recent years have seen a sudden profusion of literature that has shattered this heroic image. Coleman et. al. (1966) found that schools are neither as powerful nor as equalizing in producing cognitive achievement as we had tacitly believed. Greer (1972) has questioned the legend that the enormous waves of immigrants of the late nineteenth century were successfully integrated into American society via the schools. Illich (1971) has suggested that the effects of the schools are so pernicious in promoting an inequitable and economically wasteful society, that "deschooling" should be the highest social priority. And, most recently, Jencks (1972) has argued that there is little relationship between schooling attainments and economic outcomes.

This Report is the latest entry in the current debate on educational policy. Its ostensible purpose is to examine the opportunities for youth to develop to adulthood, the transition represented by the age span 14-24. It focuses its criticism primarily on the schools by questioning the ability of extended schooling to prepare the young for the world of work and other adult roles.

> ...Schooling, as we know it, is not a complete environment giving all the necessary opportunities for becoming adult. School is a certain kind of environment: individualistic, oriented toward cognitive achievement, imposing dependency on and withholding authority and responsibility from those in the role of students (p. vii).

Further, is is asserted that the increased length of schooling has led to a sacrifice of other opportunites that are necessary for transforming a child into an adult:

> ...opportunities for responsible action, situations in which he came to have authority over matters that affected other persons, occasions in which he experienced the consequences of all his own actions, and was strengthened by facing them --in short, all that is implied by "becoming adult" in matters other than gaining cognitive skills (p. viii).

The Study proceeds to set out a number of background aspects of youth including some historical aspects; rights of children and youth; demography and economic problems; biological, psychological, and socio-cultural aspects; educational institutions, and youth culture. The treatments of these subjects are very uneven, and it is difficult to see their connection with the Issues and Recommendations that follow. Most of the issues address the limitations in youth development created by their segregation from adults and the workplace that results largely from an extended incarceration in schools. Obstacles to providing work opportunities for youth such as legal barriers--due to child labor laws and compulsory schooling codes--and economic hurdles such as minimum wage provisions are reviewed.

The final section of the Report provides recommendations for changes or experiments that would increase the opportunities for youth

to work, to undertake non-traditional types of training and experiences, and to have more contact with other age groups. Other recommendations address the need for greater research, for self-governance experiences for youth, and for more public service opportunities.

Since the principal thrust of the Report addresses the relationship between education and work, it is this aspect of the study that we will focus on. The most important recommendation of the Report in this context is its emphasis on greater substitution of work experiences for schooling experiences. This change would be carried out by altering restrictive child-labor laws and by alternating work and schooling either within a daily schedule or by interspersing longer periods of work--several weeks or months--between periods of schooling. Increases in the demand for young people in work organizations would be provided by greater investment in public service opportunities such as VISTA and the Neighborhood Youth Corps as well as by a dual minimum wage whereby employers could pay lower minimum wages to youth than to adults. Greater availability of training and schooling programs by private firms in conjunction with work would also be emphasized.

Before proceeding with an analysis of the Report's assumptions and recommendations regarding the relations between schooling and work, it is important to note a puzzling aspect of the study. The overwhelming theme of the discussion surrounds the inadequacy of the present youth environments and particularly schooling for creating adults. If youth grow up to be less competent adults now than they did in the past, the Report should substantiate carefully this charge. Yet one searches in vain throughout the Report for an explicit and detailed analysis of

this assumption. In what ways are young adults found to be lacking? What evidence supports this contention? Despite the crucial nature of the thesis as a basis for arguing that youth environments must be changed, it is neither addressed nor documented in any way whatsoever throughout the study.

Although it is argued that schooling is an incomplete environment because it neglects activities directed towards other persons--and presumably no other institutions are available to serve this role--it is never shown that youngsters grow up any more selfish or narcissistic today than they did in the past. Instead, the evidence of the deficiencies of schooling are documented by the following glib account:

> Signs of dissatisfaction abound, from parents and taxpayers who have an inarticulate sense that something is amiss, from school administrators and teachers who are experimenting with methods and objectives and forms that differ from those of the established system, and from youth themselves, many of whom are showing individual initiative in the search for extra-curricular experiences (p.2).

Assumptions About School and Work

Doubtless, no one would contest the assertion in the Report that any single institutional environment whether school, work, family, or community is inadequate for socializing youth for adult roles. Therefore, the issue is not whether one should select schooling or work or any other single institution as an environment for youth but rather what combination of them is necessary for producing competent adults. In a sense this question can only be answered by knowing what kinds of competencies adults need and then exploring what kinds of socialization the various agencies

provide (Inkeles 1966).

The Report resolves this issue by defining it away with a sweeping generalization:

> Experience indicates that young persons need both activity directed toward self-development and useful activity directed toward the outside on which others depend. Neglect of the first results in an unskilled adult, impotent to deal with a complex world. Neglect of the second leads to frustration of the idealistic, creative, and constructive impulses of youth. For most persons these two activities, directed inward and outward, take the prosaic forms of school and work (though school does not always bring self-development and work does not always constitute productive and useful activity) (p. 137).

Thus, the issue is simplified for the reader in the following terms: only two major characteristics of youth development need be addressed, self-development and externally-oriented development. The former is produced by the institution of schooling and the latter by the institution of work. Accordingly, we need not dwell on the role of family, community, the media and other socialization influences since these do not enter the realm of socialization with which we are concerned. The Report shows remarkable consistency in neither explicating further the basis for these assumptions nor documenting them in even the crudest fashion.

Further, the study informs us that: "Schools are the principal formal institutions of society intended to bring youth into adulthood. But the schools' structures are designed wholly for self-development, particularly the acquisition of cognitive skills and of knowledge." (p. 146). That is, schools are viewed as having little or

no socialization function with respect to other adult requirements, especially the competencies for being a "responsible" worker. Given these assumptions it is not difficult to see why the Report pursues the objective of getting students into the workforce earlier in order to train them for their adult roles and to enable them to experience an outlet for their "idealistic, creative, and constructive impulses."

At this juncture it is useful to note several major differences between the views presented in the Report and our analysis: first, while the Report defines the socialization effects of schools and work in exceedingly narrow ways, we will argue that the socialization literature does not support that conclusion. In contrast, virtually all agencies of socialization including family, school, community, media, and work contribute to the formation of the attitudes, values, skills, and knowledge required for work. We will call this the "correspondence principle," since we will assert that there is a direct relationship between the demands of work organizations and all agencies of socialization.

Second, the Report ignores social class differences in socialization experiences generally and in work experiences, school experiences, and occupational attainments particularly. The impression is given that all young adults share identical environments. In contrast we will assert that a major role of the school is to reproduce the social relations of production; and that differential socialization of work traits takes place according to the social class origins of youth in order to fill out the highly unequal work hierarchy inherent in capitalist production.

Third, the Report makes no attempt to support its underlying thesis that young adults are inadequately socialized for their adult roles. We will argue that they are well prepared for the adult roles that face them in society. Further, we will assert that the problems of dissatisfaction with both school and work are more directly related to the alienating environments of both work organizations and schools than by inadequate socialization for meeting the demands of work.

Finally, we will show how the recommendations that follow from our analysis differ from those of the Report. In general, we will argue for the transformation of adult roles, particularly work roles, and we will contend that the socialization of youth for these new roles will follow closely.

II. SOCIALIZATION FOR WORK ROLES

Any reading of the socialization literature tends to conflict with the extreme isolation of institutional roles reflected in the Report. To the contrary, all agencies of socialization overlap in their mission to transmit the culture. Surveys of literature on socialization of the young to occupational roles show links between family interactions, peer influences, schooling experiences and occupational experiences on the one hand and work roles on the other (D. Gold 1974; M. Goldberg 1974). Throughout this literature it is evident that many influences contribute to the formation of the attitudes, values, behaviors, and skills which are necessary to function in a given occupational role. The work of Inkeles on the formation of modern man indicates that among the six countries studied virtually all of these influences contributed to the attitudes and behaviors which are necessary in modern industrial production as well as other facets of modern life (Inkeles 1969; Inkeles and Smith 1974). In our view there is little support for the narrow stance that school and work perform narrow socialization roles and that other institutions are not important at all.

A second theme reflected in the socialization literature also differs from the presentation of the Report. While the discussion of the Report always refers to socialization requirements and adult competencies as generalizable to the entire male population, the socialization literature reports very important differences among both institutional influences and adult roles along social class dimensions. That is, the set of socialization influences that affect

an individual are largely predetermined by his socio-economic origins. Families, communities, schools, and workplaces tend to inculcate different attitudes, values, cognitive skills, and behaviors according to their class orientation. The literature suggests that the institutional influences that affect the formation of children and youth tend to perpetuate these social class differences (S. Bowles 1972). By referring to some implicit common issue in the socialization of youth-- although never specifying what it consists of explicitly--the issues of class are avoided. In our view these systematic differences in the socialization and preparation of youth are of as great importance as a national issue as is the overall question of youth environments.

Thus, the literature on socialization suggests that limiting the discussion of socialization to only school and work and imputing narrow roles to each is not warranted, and that social class differences in institutional influences and adult roles represent a significant obstacle to generalizing about the experiences of youth. But, more specifically, it can be shown that schools do indeed prepare the young for the realities of work in far more than a cognitive sense.

The view that schools are primarily a cognitive influence and that they represent the dominant instrument for cognitive socialization as reflected in the Report is refuted by a number of empirical studies. Virtually all of the statistical studies which have attempted to determine the causes of student achievement have concluded that most of the explainable variance in test scores is attributable to out-of-school influences rather than in-school ones (Coleman et. al 1966;

Averch et. al. 1972). While it is clear that children and young adults learn many skills and cognitive proficiences in school, they also learn many of them out-of-school. Of course, the amount and nature of cognitive proficiencies and non-cognitive socialization that takes place both in and out of the school seems crucially related to the social class origins of the child.

Other studies attempt to determine what aspect of schooling is related to success in labor markets. That is, we know that educational attainments in terms of years of schooling on the one hand and earnings and occupational success on the other are closely related statistically. If the true effect of schooling on earnings and occupation were attributable to the cognitive effect of schooling, it would be expected that the statistical relationship between years of schooling and work success would be attenuated or eliminated once we controlled for the cognitive test scores of workers. That is, the cognitive theory of schooling's effect on such outcomes as earnings suggests that the reason that years of schooling have an important impact is because educational attainment is a surrogate for cognitive development.

Yet, when attempts have been made to explain the variance in earnings by both test scores and educational attainment of workers, the apparent statistical effect of years of schooling is only slightly diminished (H. Gintis 1971; Z. Griliches and W. Mason 1972). Different studies that have used test scores, years of schooling, and other variables to explain earnings suggest that the apparent effect of the amount of schooling on earnings is reduced by only 4 percent to a maximum of about one-third when test scores are introduced in the

relations, and the increase in explained variance by using test scores is negligible (Gintis 1971). Accordingly, it appears that the principal effect of education on labor market success is through some other effect than the cognitive one.

We believe that a much clearer picture of the role of schooling in the socialization process emerges when one considers it in a context of correspondence. Following the model of Inkeles, every society creates specific demands for competency upon its adults, and it is the purpose of all institutions of socialization to fulfill these demands by socializing the population to attain these competencies (Inkeles 1966). Since work represents one of the most important adult roles, it is important to study the nature of work roles and their relations to the functions of schooling.

In contrast to the romantic descriptions of work used in the Report--an outlet for idealistic, creative, and constructive impulses --evaluations of work in our society have found it to be alienating, dehumanizing, and violent to the spirit as well as to the body (K. Lasson 1972; S. Terkel 1974). The recent study on Work in America sponsored by a special Task Force of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1973) found the quality of working life to be one of the major issues of our time. As we will note later, greater questions should be raised about the competencies required for working life than about the environments that seem to be producing these competencies. What, then, are some of the requirements of work organizations, and how are they tied to school environments?

In his review of personality characteristics required for job-performance in the bureaucratic and hierarchically-organized enterprises that characterize our society, Gintis (1971) identifies four types of personality requisites. (1) proper level of subordination; (2) discipline; (3) supremacy of cognitive over affective modes of response; and (4) motivation according to external reward structures. Each of these, in turn, can be shown to be linked to the agenda of schools.

For example, subordination and proper orientation to authority along hierarchical lines are necessary in virtually all modern, work-enterprises. "As the worker relinquishes control over his activities on the job, so the student is first forced to accept and later comes personally to terms with his loss of autonomy and initiative to a teacher who acts as a superior authority, dispensing rewards and penalties." (Gintis 1971:274). The discipline of the bureaucratic work structure with its requirements of highly regularized and conforming behavior to time schedules, regulations, and stifling conformity are reflected in the schools by Silberman's summary of the school environment: "...how oppressive and petty are the rules by which they [the schools] are governed." (Silberman 1970:11).

Further, as Weber (1958) has noted, bureaucracies function best when social relationships are characterized by "rational matter-of-factness" rather than emotion. "Its specific nature which is welcomed by capitalism, develops the more perfectly the more the bureaucracy is 'dehumanized,' the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business, love, hatred, and all purely

personal irrational and emotional elements which escape calculation." Dreeben (1968) refers to the emphasis away from affect and towards "...matter-of-factness in the accomplishment of tasks that governs the relationship between teachers and pupils." (p.29-30). Further, Gintis (1971) found that teacher ratings of students tended to be higher for personality traits that were related to the cognitive mode of expression and lower for those that were related to affective modes (p. 276).

Finally, since workers have little or no control over the attributes of the product or nature of their work, it is necessary to motivate them through rewards that are external to the work itself such as money and prestige. It is obvious that similar conditions exist in the school where the student has little control over his circumstances, and his activities are not determined primarily by his intrinsic interests and concerns. Rather they are imposed upon him by a highly planned and routinized organization that manipulates his activities and the conditions under which he pursues those activities, and in order to obtain his conformance and cooperation with this reality there is a heavy dependence on external rewards such as grades, class ranks, and diplomas (Dreeben 1968: 33-35).

In summary, the social relations of "production" in schooling serve to reproduce the social relations of work (Bowles 1972; Gintis 1971; Levin 1974). It takes little imagination to see the correspondence between grades for school performance and wages for work performance; to see the alienation and boredom of the assembly line

mirror the stifling environment and boredom of the educational assembly line (Silberman 1970); to see the competition among students for grades parallel the competition among workers for advancement; to see the teacher in the classroom impose his arbitrary values on his underlings just as does the boss on the job (neither legitimacy of authority resulting from a democratic election). These relations are reinforced by the findings of Gintis (1971) that higher grades are given to those students who exhibit traits that are functional in production (even when scholastic achievement is accounted for), and by Brenner (1968) that teachers' evaluations of student conduct serve as better predictors of the students' later work success (as reflected in supervisors' work ratings) than do students' scholastic records.

Social Class Differentiation for Work Roles

Without question the schools are a major socializing influence in preparing youth for the realities of the workplace. What must be emphasized in this context is the fact that all individuals are not socialized for the same work positions. Since work organizations are characterized by hierarchical roles with respect to such matters as individual responsibility, authority, pay, and prestige, then the corresponding output of the schools must also contribute to the differentiation of workers for such roles. Accordingly, the schools serve to prepare workers to fill out the work hierarchy by differentiating both the amounts of and types of schooling experiences that they receive. For example, low-level workers need only be inculcated with minimum cognitive attainments, the ability to follow

orders, to show deference to authority, and so on. Middle level workers need higher levels of cognitive attainments, and the abilities to give orders as well as follow them but with somewhat more independence than lower level ones who are expected to conform completely to the work organization and its rules. Finally, individuals at the top of the occupational hierarchy must have the ability to show great independence in behavior; high cognitive skills; modes of self presentation that denote authority; and so on.

The system of class socialization reflected in the schools and other institutions of our society tend to reproduce the social division of labor according to the class origins of youth (Bowles 1972). On the average, a student whose father is working class will have less money spent on his education and will undertake fewer years of schooling than one whose father is in a higher status occupation. Since educational attainments are a principal determinant of social and occupational mobility and attainment, the lower class child finds that his relatively modest schooling limits him to lower class jobs. This reality is a function of the many overlapping socialization influences that reinforce the class structure, but the schools represent a prime supporting ingredient.

Two aspects of schooling are especially noteworthy in this regard; the way that they are financed and the class-oriented nature of school environments. In general, elementary and secondary education are supported according to the wealth and income of State and local jurisdictions. That is, the present methods of financing education assure that a larger amount of support will be available for children in wealthy States and school districts than in poorer ones.

(Coons, Clune, and Sugarman 1970). In turn, recent research has ascertained that the expenditure per student is directly related to the amount of education that a student will obtain, even when social class origins are held constant (G. E. Johnson and F. P. Stafford 1973).

At the level of higher education, too, financial arrangements tend to subsidize the rich more than the poor, even under the low tuition policies of the public systems (Hansen and Weisbrod, 1970). Children from lower income families are less able to fund the non-tuition and living expenses of higher education, and they are less likely to have fulfilled the academic requirements for gaining admission to colleges and universities. For example, they are less likely to have completed high school. Even when they do participate in the higher educational system, it is likely to be in the lower-cost community college segment. Studies of the higher educational systems of both Florida and California have found that the amount of public subsidy provided for students is a direct function of their family income (Hansen and Weisbrod 1970; Windham 1970).

But, systematic differences in expenditures in favor of the wealthy are only one of the ways in which the schools tend to reinforce the class structure. For example, school environments tend to differ according to the social class origins of students so that students from lower class families are inculcated with the traits requisite for being workers while children from more lofty class backgrounds are socialized to be managers and professionals. So-called "ability" tracking and testing represent one of the primary

ways by which this is rationalized within schools (Bowles and Gintis 1973), but even more revealing is the class-related nature of education among schools.

The differential nature of schools according to the social origins of the child can be readily observed by anyone who lives within the proximity of a large city. One need only compare a high school in the inner-city attended by children from low income and minority backgrounds with one situated a few miles away in an affluent suburb. Although such a comparison focuses on the two poles of the social class spectrum, the systematic influence of student social class origin on school socialization can be generalized as a combination of these extremes for all stations in between.

The lower class school and curricula are characterized by a high degree of external discipline. Rules abound and are rigidly enforced; written passes are required to leave classes during session, even to go to the restroom; and various types of corporal punishment, threats of suspension, and verbal abuse are used to maintain control. Decisions about each child's studies are made impersonally by counselors with little input from the student; and alternatives are few anyway in such schools. In such an environment the students learn to take orders and respond to authority. The institution provides them with few choices. They sense their lack of worth to the organization with the knowledge that they could drop-out tomorrow, and someone would replace them. Only the school records would change. Of course, this socialization pattern corresponds with the needs of unskilled workers who need primarily to defer to authority; to respond passively to

orders; to accept alienation from work and to become one of the faceless multitudes at the bottom of the work hierarchy (Raskin 1971) Of course, since there will be many with these traits relative to job demand, employment will always be a transient and uncertain phenomenon. (D. Gordon 1972)

In contrast, the upper middle class students are attending schools where the rules are relatively few and less consistently enforced. It is well-known among students that almost any rule can be violated under some circumstances, and plea-bargaining is common. Indeed, most conflicts between teachers and administrators on the one hand and students on the other are resolved through negotiation and discussion rather than through summary action on the part of adults. Students walk freely about the school at all times. Permission is not needed to leave class or to enter and leave the campus. Decisions about a youngster's program of studies are based upon discussions between counselor and pupil in order to select from among the large number of available course offerings. When certain learning experiences are not available in the curriculum, special programs of individual or small-group study can be arranged. Virtually all students are expected to study academic subjects in order to enter colleges and universities.

Such an environment tends to inculcate those traits that are functional in making decisions about the work organization itself and about the conditions that affect the workers at lower echelons. The experiences provided by the "flexible" nature of school rules and negotiation for special privileges represent preparation for

those who will make the rules and engage in conflict resolution with other persons at high levels of decision-making. The independence that is reflected in choosing among the large range of alternative educational experiences provides good training for selecting among alternative management strategies. The freedom to choose schooling hours and activities is also functional in preparing upper-middle class students for the relative freedom that they will have in setting their work schedules in contrast with the wage and hour arrangements or fixed schedules of lower-level salaried workers. In a sense such youngsters are being socialized to be the "bosses," while the ones who are in the inner-city school are being prepared to be the workers or the unemployed. The former will learn to give the orders and the latter to follow them.

Nor is the process of differential socialization limited to elementary and secondary education alone. Higher educational institutions are also stratified in terms of the functions that they perform in differentiating the labor force for positions in the occupational hierarchy. The role of the community colleges is especially interesting in this regard. For example, Karabel (1972) has argued that such institutions serve primarily a "cooling out" function for working class students who aspire towards bachelors degrees, and the high dropout rates from these institutions as well as the applied types of course offerings tend to support this view. A recent passionate defense of the community colleges against this interpretation argues that they are successful precisely <u>because</u> lower class aspirants will meet the same conditions that they will face in the labor market

(presumably in lower status occupations):

> ...the effort required of the community college student in order to maintain his status and progress within the institution is not unlike the effort that the same student will have to expend once he enters the workaday world. The sacrifices and committment that he must make, the postponement of economic rewards, and hard work required are very much like those required of anyone who seeks to advance in a chosen career (Bushnell and Kievit 1974:52).

Over time it seems that community colleges have become the new prerequisite for integrating the working class into the class structure as the educational attainments of society have mushroomed (Bowles 1972 a).

Finally, the socialization process needed to change an environment, rather than simply to adapt to a situation does not occur in working class schools, and it is less likely to develop in those higher educational institutions catering to a lower social class clientele than in more elite institutions. The very group that is most likely to want to change its environment (those with the least rewarding jobs and political power and with the most frustrating existence) are least equipped by all the agents of socialization, including schools, to undertake that change.

III. REAPPRAISING WHAT IS WRONG

The major thesis of our discussion up to this point has been that there is a direct relation--reflected in the correspondence principle--between the demands of work and the agencies of socialization which prepare people for work. We have emphasized that a worker needs special character traits in addition to cognitive skills to function productively in a hierarchically organized work environment. Not only do schools produce cognitive skills, they also develop those character traits which all workers need regardless of their position in the hierarchy. Moreover, schools differentially socialize children from different social class backgrounds into the attitudes and behavior patterns appropriate to the position in the hierarchy which they are expected to fill. If our arguments about the correspondence of school and work social structures are valid, then the "problem" with youths and the young workers does not result from inadequate socialization, but is rooted in the alienating environments common to both workplace and school.

In our view the demands for competencies are created by adult society, and schools and other agents of socialization follow these demands. In short, we do not believe that schools can remake society. To the contrary the schools serve society and tend to reproduce the dominant social, economic, and political values reflected by the prevailing institutions and ideologies. That is, educational reform is only possible when it does not conflict with the structure of its host society or polity (Levin 1974). Accordingly, given correspondence, what evidence do we have that anything is wrong? The Report

suggests that "signs of dissatisfaction abound" with schools, but specific details are scant. We agree that many youngsters are "turned-off" to schools. They find them repressive, petty, and destructive of human values and feelings.

Since it is largely the demands of work organizations which have shaped school structures and environments (J. Spring 1972), it is the work process itself that is responsible for this alienation. What aspects of the work situation are responsible for making work (and schooling) alienating? Why don't the majority of jobs function as an outlet for "idealistic, creative and constructive impulses?" The answer lies at the heart of existing work organizations with their focus on wage contracts and pyramidal hierarchies rather than on human relationships. Through the system of wage contracts and hierarchical structure of production relationships, workers lose control of both the product and the process of their labor. They are separated and placed in structurally antagonistic relationships to one another in order to enhance the control function of the organization. It is alienation from work activity itself and from fellow workers that results in the degradation of work from a free, creative, cooperative activity to a coerced means of individual existence.

Under a system of wage contracts the worker sells his labor to the employer and in return receives a wage. It is then the job of the employer to extract labor from the worker. The use of force to extract labor would disrupt the production process and run counter to even the most superficial democratic precepts. Therefore, the employer seeks to obtain the "voluntary" cooperation of his labor force.

There are many methods of doing this, but historically the dominant method chosen has been to design technology that routinizes as far as possible the tasks a worker must do. The worker need not think for himself, but need only follow prescribed routine. This procedure simplifies the task of supervision and increases the employers' control over the productive process. The history of technological development has reflected a tendency toward increasingly fragmented, routinized bureaucratized tasks (Marglin 1971).

Employers rationalize the existence of hierarchical structures in production by arguing that increasing division of labor increases productivity and, therefore, wages. The workers labor neither for intrinsic satisfaction in their work activity nor to cooperatively create products and services which society needs, but merely to earn the wages which permit them to consume what they want as individuals. They don't experience productive activity as the unification of themselves with other workers in a network of mutual dependence and cooperation; but merely as a means to their individual consumption. The individualism, self-centeredness and competitiveness inherent in this situation are functional to and a structural characteristic of the hierarchical relationships among persons in the productive process.

Hierarchy is a natural outgrowth of the development of a technology which maximizes division of labor and minimizes thought and decision-making by the direct producers of the product. Such a technology coupled with employers' desire to maintain control of the production process creates a "need" for foremen and supervisors, quality control

specialists, administrative personnel to coordinate production, engineers to collect data on and, "improve the efficiency of", production, researchers and analysts to provide necessary data for the decisions made by the elite few at the top of the hierarchy and so on. Leaving aside the question of the necessity of this proliferation of the hierarchy for the technical efficiency of production, it is clear that it serves to cement the control of those at or near the top of the hierarchy. The most direct effect of hierarchy is that it keeps those workers at the bottom of the hierarchy whose pay is lowest and whose work is most boring and routinized, ignorant of the operation of the production process as a whole. This ignorance forces them to accept the fact that decisions about their productive activity must be made by those who are more knowledgeable and higher up.

Some workers might think that if they could gain some experience at higher job levels in the hierarchy they could perform as competently as those who currently hold those positions. This type of thinking is discouraged by the higher formal education requirements necessary for job entry above the lower levels. The explicit suggestion is that no amount of experience can substitute for a college degree in these types of jobs. With the absence of any chance for the worker to learn how well he can perform some higher function, he accepts the educational requirement as binding and doesn't seriously aspire to those positions. His major hope is that his children will receive a good education so they can attain the privileged positions in the hierarchy.

The worker is colonized through hierarchy into accepting the view that his "ignorance" inevitably relegates him to non-thinking and

routinized jobs. Since work does not offer an outlet for gratification, he turns toward consumption activity for fulfillment as well as such other forms of escapism as alcohol and drugs. Work represents only a means to earn the wages to consume, and weekends, vacations, and retirement become the milestones of his existence. Personal "growth" is assessed not through the development of productive skills but through steadily escalating levels of consumption. New and faster cars replace older ones, and clothing styles and weed-free lawns become the basis for personal prestige. But his consumption can be augmented only by increasing his wages, and that means conforming with the demands of the employer and the work organization even when his sense of justice and fairness are violated.

While production workers can't aspire to any of the choice jobs in the middle or near the top of the hierarchy, there are usually mini-hierarchies within which there is some possible movement. These mini-hierarchies or job ladders prevent workers from becoming completely frustrated and preserve the illusions of real mobility in this society (Doeringer and Piore 1971). At the same time they encourage stable work behavior, since promotion along the ladders depends on seniority which is attained by doing an "adequate" job and not causing any trouble. Moreover, since pay differentials between jobs at the top and bottom of these ladders can be on the order of three to one, workers who have moved off the bottom rungs acquire a vested interest in the preservation of the system. Thus, these mini-hierarchies legitimize the overall hierarchical structure of production.

A final stabilizing function of hierarchy is that the workers who

have the most oppressive jobs, seldom, if ever, come in direct contact with persons at or near the top of the hierarchy. Instead, the direct agent of their oppression is another worker - a foreman, or a quality control supervisor. Workers in the lower and lower middle levels of the productive hierarchy are placed in a directly antagonistic relationship. Their aggressions are channeled against each other. The ultimate cause of their oppression, the oligarchic elite of bosses who control production and reap the benefits of the extreme hierarchical fragmentation of production, is obscured.

In short, our thesis is that what is wrong with the socialization of youth is reflected in the adult roles that we are preparing the young to undertake. Inequalities in adult status are reflected in similar inequalities in schools and other agencies of socialization. Alienation from both process and product of work are mirrored in the alienation from the schooling process. All of these traits of schools that we wish to change are immutable as long as they are functional to the organization of work in our society. More generally, the real problems of youth socialization are precisely the fidelity of socializing institutions to the organization of adult life, particularly working life. The dilemma that we face is that we are preparing youngsters only too well for relatively alienated and unfulfilling adult roles.

In contrast with the Report, we believe that the transition of youth to adulthood cannot be understood without discussing the specific nature of adulthood. In the final section we will argue that the democratization of the workplace is a necessary prerequisite to the

democratization of the school. Rewarding relationships with co-workers and worker participation in decision-making must exist before the schools will become more humane and participative themselves; and greater equality of work roles are a precondition of greater equality in educational outcomes.

IV. WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

If the problem is not directly in the socialization of youth as much as it is the nature of adult society, what is to be done to improve the environments which shape our children and young adults? In our view the agencies of socialization of youth replicate those of adult society, and they function well to prepare the young for the existing realities of adult life and to reproduce the class structure. Accordingly, any attempt to alter the socialization of the young must necessarily begin with the transformation of adult roles in society, particularly the roles presently assumed by low to middle income adults.

It is useful to integrate this view with one of the major themes of the Report. "Adulthood cannot be accomplished merely by the acquisition of self-serving capabilities. These must be augmented by capabilities for mutually rewarding involvement with others." (p.4). The Report goes on to list three characteristics of such "mutually rewarding involvement": 1) experience with persons differing in social class, subculture, and in age; 2) the experience of having others dependent on one's actions; and 3) interdependent activities directed toward collective goals. The report concludes that in order to achieve these capabilities it is necessary to change certain youth-oriented institutions and to bring youth earlier into adult institutions -- primarily the work place.

But we have argued that the work place is hierarchical and alienating. For most people, job experiences are not rewarding beyond pecuniary gain. Work is necessary in order to consume and

consumption is the sphere of activity where people can express their "freedom" and "creativity" to the extent that they can afford to do so. Witness the campers, laden with motorcycles, snowmobiles, and motorboats on the nation's highways; the high-styled clothing of low and middle-income blacks; and, as the Report itself points out, the massive consumption by youth.

The work place is anything but free and creative for the average worker, and it is anything but a place where people have cooperative experiences with people from different social classes and subcultures. It is true that others may depend on a workers actions, but often this dependence is an antagonistic one since many dependency relations are conditioned by the hierarchical context of the work place;the foreman is dependent on the workers to follow the rules, and the workers are dependent on the foreman for favors and rewards, but such a relationship is not necessarily a cooperative one. Furthermore, as it now exists, the purpose of work is to maximize individual gain, even if it is at the expense of other workers. Thus skilled workers have traditionally been antagonistic to unskilled worker's needs, since the two groups have been set historically against each other in the struggle for wages. Racial antagonisms and sexual discrimination in the work place represent similar types of conflicts among groups of workers.

The failure of existing work organizations to carry out these goals is not unlike the inadequacy of the schools in these domains. The obvious policy implication is that we must change the nature of work in order to make it more democratic, participative, cooperative, and interdependent in positive ways. Fortunately we are at a point

in post-industrial society where this vision is truly a possibility. The very great alienation which has been so necessary for hierarchical production is now turning against the system, not in organized ways but in the more subtle forms of problems of quality control, wildcat strikes, and rising incidences of alcoholism, drug usage, employee absenteeism and employee turnover.

These consequences have become so serious that the problem has been recognized at the national level by a U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Task Force (1973). This controversial report has suggested that if the nature of work does not change in such a way as to increase the participation of workers in decision-making and to reduce worker alienation, major disruptions of normal production activities and reduced productivity can be foreseen.

In our view we should attempt to encourage and implement the changes that are being considered so that work environments become truly participative, cooperative, and humane and so that they provide an intrinsic satisfaction to workers. If we can transform the reality of adulthood, we believe that the socialization of youth will follow according to the correspondence principle. Parents, media, and the schools will begin to socialize youth for the new reality of sharing, cooperation, and a social consciousness. These will be the traits that will be functional under the new order.

It is through the democratization of the work place that the primary institution of the adult world (the work situation) could be radically transformed. Workers in a democratized plant would,

indeed, have a collective goal: the maximization of their well being. This process might include both increases in production as well as a reorganization of the work process so that members of the work team experience a comraderie and sense of sharing. Gratification from involvement in the work process would replace alienation from it. No longer would the work place be merely an oppressive environment for obtaining the money to satisfy a compulsive consumption pattern. And, the social consciousness, sharing, and democratic participation for achieving the group-determined goals that would become a primary educational objective of the work place would carry over to other institutions as well.

In many respects this transition would enable schools, families, and media to be more successful in their present quest to inculcate youth with civic responsibility--the duty to participate both politically and in the public service of their local communities. The decline in hierarchy of production organizations and the increase in worker control of production would provide a major adult experience in democratic decision-making and participation that would reinforce the efforts of and serve as role models for the media, schools, families, and other socialization influences. The dominance of humanism over property in such a society would pervade the youth environment.

Furthermore, industrial democracy would have an important effect on the distribution of cognitive knowledge: 1) Greater participation in the production process would tend to increase the training and education of all workers, but especially those drawn from the lower echelons who receive only limited training and work experiences at

present. Under a democratized organization, the access to training and knowledge would be distributed more widely as a prerequisite to greater worker participation. In contrast, the present hierarchical structures tend to stratify access and exposure to knowledge, particularly that which is related to the management and financial aspects of production decisions. 2) Correspondingly, the schools would also have to prepare youth more equally for the world of work. They would have to find ways to develop much more general skills in working class youth, including the abilities to handle an information rich environment, and to handle new situations, abilities that are presently limited largely to upper-class youth.

This is obviously an idealistic vision of a democratic industrial society. The transition to such a society is fraught with difficulties, but we do not believe that appropriate changes in the socialization of youth are possible without moving in this direction. More specifically we do not believe that the young will be socialized to be creative, participative, and cooperative until the social relations of adults are characterized by those traits. The desirable portrait of youth that has been painted in the Report cannot be achieved in a society which alienates worker from worker and worker from his product. Youth apparently understands this much better than the authors of the Report; for the rise of the present youth culture is in part a reaction to a hierarchical, dehumanized adult world. We suggest that rather than deemphasize the youth culture by an earlier incorporation of youth into this world, we should humanize and democratize the work place and the institutions which prepare people for work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Averch, Harvey, Stephen Carroll, Theodore Donaldson, Herbert Kiesling, and John Pincus, "How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings." (Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1972).

Bowles, Samuel, "Contradiction in U.S. Higher Education," James Weaver (ed.), Political Economy: Radical vs. Orthodox Approaches (Boston, Mass: Allyn and Bacon, 1972) 1972a.

Bowles, Samuel, "Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor" in Martin Carnoy (ed.), Schooling in a Corporate Society (New York: David McKay Company Inc., 1972).

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis, "IQ in the U.S. Class Structure" Social Policy, (Jan./Feb. 1973).

Brenner, Marshall H., "Use of High School Data to Predict Work Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 52 (Jan. 1968).

Bushnell, David S. and Mary Bach Kievit, "Community Colleges: What is Our Job"?, Change, (April 1974), pp. 52-53.

Coleman, James S., et. al., Equality of Educational Opportunity OE 38001, U.S. Office of Education (Washington, D.C., 1966).

Coons, John E., William H. Clune III and Stephan D. Sugarman, Private Wealth and Public Education, Belknap Press (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1970).

Doeringer, P.B. and M.J. Piore, Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1971).

Dreeben, Robert, On What is Learned in School (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley and Co., 1968).

Gintis, Herbert, "Education, Technology and the Characteristics of Worker Productivity," American Economic Review, Vol LXI, No. 2 (May 1971), pp. 266-279.

Gold, David, "Socialization to Occupational Roles," (Portola Institute, February 1974).

Goldberg, Marilyn Power, "Sex Role Socialization and Work Roles: The Experience of Women," (Portola Institute, February 1974).

Gordon, David M., Theories of Poverty and Underemployment (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1972).

Greer, Colin, The Great School Legend (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

Griliches, Z. and W. Mason, "Education, Income, and Ability," Journal of Political Economy, Supplement (May/June 1972), pp. S. 74-S. 103.

Hansen, W. Lee and Burton Weisbrod, Benefits, Costs, and Finances of Higher Education (Chicago:. Markham Publishing Co., 1970).

Illich, Ivan, De-Schooling Society (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1971),

Inkeles, Alex, "Making Men Modern: On the Causes and Consequences of Individual Change in Six Developing Countries," American Journal of Sociology, Vol.75, No. 2 (Sept. 1969) pp. 208-225.

Inkeles, Alex, "The Socialization of Competence," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Summer 1966), pp. 265-283.

Inkeles, Alex and David H. Smith, Becoming Modern (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, August 1974).

Jencks, Christopher et. al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

Johnson, George E. and Frank P. Stafford, "Social Returns to Quantity and Quality of Schooling," The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (Spring 1973), pp. 138-155.

Karabel, Jerome, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. Forty-Two, No. 4 (November 1972), pp. 521-562

Lasson, Kenneth, The Workers (New York: Bantam Books, 1972).

Levin, Henry M., "Educational Reform and Social Change," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 10, No. 3 (August 1974).

Marglin, Stephen, "What do Bosses Do? The Origins and Functions of Hierarchy in Capitalist Production," (Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper No. 222, November 1971) Harvard University.

Raskin, Marcus, Being and Doing (New York: Random House, 1971).

Silberman, Charles, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970).

Spring, Joel, Schooling and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1972).

Terkel, Studs, Working (New York: Pantheon Books, 1974).

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Work In America (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 1973).

Weber, Max, "On Bureaucracy," in Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: 1958).

Windham, Douglas M., Education, Equality, and Income Redistribution (Lexington, Mass.: Heath-Lexington Books, 1970).